

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/633,371		08/01/2003	Scott A. Webb	5259-14600	5259-14600 5117	
35690	7590	06/05/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
		OD, KIVLIN, KOV	REIMERS, ANNETTE R			
700 LAVAO AUSTIN, T	-			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,				3733		

DATE MAILED: 06/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			6
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/633,371	WEBB ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Annette R. Reimers	3733	_
The MAILING DATE of this communication apperiod for Reply	opears on the cover sheet with the	ne correspondence address -	•
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perio - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statuany reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply to d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS ate, cause the application to become ABAND	TON. be timely filed from the mailing date of this communication ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10	<u>May 2006</u> .		
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ Th	is action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow			s is
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11	, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) <u>1-59,74,75 and 86-88</u> is/are pending 4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>59,74,75 and 86-88</u> 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		ration.	
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-58</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on <u>01 August 2003</u> is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the I	e: a) \boxtimes accepted or b) \square object the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s objected to. See 37 CFR 1.12	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume. 2. Certified copies of the priority docume. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bure. * See the attached detailed Office action for a list.	nts have been received. nts have been received in Appli iority documents have been rec au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	cation No eived in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Sumr		
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	Paper No(s)/Ma 5) Notice of Inform 6) Other:	ail Date nal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 10/633,371

Art Unit: 3733

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Invention I, drawn to a spinal implant, i.e. claims 1-58, in the reply filed on May 10, 2006 is acknowledged. Examiner agrees with applicant that a species election is not necessary for the rasp or the guide, since inventions to those species were not elected.

Claims 59, 74-75 and 86-88 have been withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on May 10, 2006.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-15 and 18-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Biscup (US Patent Number 6,245,108).

Biscup discloses a spinal implant comprising a top, 20, a bottom, 30, a curved anterior side, 60, a curved posterior side, 70, (see column 4, lines 16-17 and column 10, lines 44-46) and an opening, 130, extending through the spinal implant from the top to the bottom, protrusions, 80, a recess, 150, groove, 140 (see figures 1 and 2). The

Application/Control Number: 10/633,371

Art Unit: 3733

proximal end can be substantially flat or rounded and the distal end can be tapered or curved (see figures 1 and 2 and column 5, lines 37-48).

The protrusions can differ in height, pattern, shape, spacing, coarseness and fineness (see column 4, lines 38-62). The implant can comprise bone, polyether ether ketone, metal, titanium, one or more openings for X-ray sensitive material, the top can be treated to promote osseointegration of the implant with bone, the top can be roughened to promote fusion of the spinal implant with bone, and the opening can receive packing material (see column 3, lines 56-67, column 4, lines 1-10, and 38-67, column 5, lines 1-36, and column 10, lines 32-37).

With regard to the statement of intended use and other functional statements, they do not impose any structural limitations on the claims distinguishable over Biscup, which is capable of being used as claimed if one so desires to do so. In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and In re Otto, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). Furthermore, the law of anticipation does not require that the reference "teach" what the subject patent teaches, but rather it is only necessary that the claims under attack "read on" something in the reference. Kalman v. Kimberly Clark Corp., 218 USPQ 781 (CCPA 1983). Furthermore, the manner in which a device is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. Ex parte Masham, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987).

Application/Control Number: 10/633,371

Art Unit: 3733

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Biscup (US Patent Number 6,245,108) in view of Ross et al. (US Patent Publication Number 2005/0004671).

Biscup discloses the claimed invention except an inner surface of the anterior side and an inner surface of the posterior side each comprising one or more projections extending into the opening. Ross et al. disclose a spinal implant and an inner surface of the anterior side and an inner surface of the posterior side each comprising one or more projections extending into the opening (see figure 5-7). In addition, Ross et al. teach the use of the projections as support structures (see paragraph 0048). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the device of Biscup with an inner surface of the anterior side and an inner surface of the posterior side each comprising one or more projections extending into the opening, in view of Ross et al., in order for the projections to serve as support structures for the implant

Application/Control Number: 10/633,371 Page 5

Art Unit: 3733

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure. See PTO 892 for art cited of interest.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to Annette R. Reimers whose telephone number is

(571) 272-7135. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Eduardo Robert can be reached on (571) 272-4719. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ΔR

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER